



## **Proposed Plan Summary**

# **Fields Brook Superfund Site Floodplain/Wetland Area**

**November 1996**

**Ashtabula, Ohio**

### ***Public Comment Period***

U.S. EPA will accept written comments on the Proposed Plan and Feasibility Study during a public comment period:

Date: November 13 to  
December 13, 1996

### ***Public Meeting***

U.S. EPA will hold a public meeting to explain the Proposed Plan and all alternatives presented in the Feasibility Study. Oral and written comments will also be accepted at the meeting:

Date: November 21, 1996

Time: 7:00 to 9:00 p.m.

Place: Kent State-Ashtabula Campus  
Blue and Gold Room  
3325 West 13th Street  
Ashtabula, OH

### **Introduction**

This Proposed Plan summary describes the alternatives considered and the Proposed Plan for Superfund remediation of the Floodplain/Wetland Area of the Fields Brook Superfund site in Ashtabula, Ohio. The Proposed Plan is described in detail in the attached fact sheet.

### **Site Background**

The Fields Brook Superfund site is located in Ashtabula, in northeast Ohio. Fields Brook flows through an industrialized area of Ashtabula that includes several chemical companies and waste disposal sites.

The floodplain adjacent to Fields Brook has become contaminated with PCBs, hexachlorobenzene (HCB) and other hazardous substances resulting from discharges to Fields Brook (see Glossary at end of the attached fact sheet for a definition of these substances).

The site was placed on the U.S. EPA's National Priorities List in 1983 and in 1985 the U.S. EPA began a detailed investigation of contamination at the site. The Fields Brook site was divided into three areas for investigation and subsequent cleanup:

- the source of the contaminants (industrial uses near Fields Brook);
- Fields Brook itself; and

- the floodplain and wetland adjacent to Fields Brook.

The Ashtabula River sediments, Ashtabula Harbor, and City of Ashtabula water intake were also investigated. This Proposed Plan deals only with cleanup of the floodplain and wetland adjacent to Fields Brook.

### **Results of Feasibility Study**

The U.S. EPA and the parties believed responsible for contaminating Fields Brook completed their reports on the floodplain and wetland areas investigation in fall 1996. The primary reports include a Remedial Investigation Report, Human Risk Assessment, Ecological Risk Assessment, and a Feasibility Study. The Remedial Investigation Report presents the results of sampling conducted in the floodplain and wetland areas. The Risk Assessments describe the potential risk to human health and the environment posed by the contaminants in the Fields Brook floodplain and wetland areas. The Feasibility Study (FS) evaluates the alternatives for cleaning up the floodplains and wetlands.

Eight alternatives were evaluated in the FS, including a "no-action" alternative. The seven "action" alternatives involve several common measures including site preparation, institutional controls such as fencing and deed restrictions to prevent residen-



## **What's Next**

The U.S. EPA will consider all comments received during the public comment period before selecting a final cleanup remedy. A public hearing will be held on November 21st at the Kent State-Ashtabula Campus to receive comments on the recommended alternative. A pre-addressed comment form is included in the attached fact sheet if you wish to send your comments to the U.S. EPA. All written comments must be postmarked by December 13.

Following selection of the final cleanup remedy, the cleanup remedy will be designed and implemented.

## **Additional Information**

Anyone interested in learning more about the investigation of the Fields Brook Superfund site and the Proposed Plan for controlling contamination at the Fields Brook floodplain and wetland areas is encouraged to review copies of the FS, Risk Assessments, Proposed Plan, and other materials related to the site. These documents may be reviewed at the information repositories for the site. See the attached fact sheet for addresses of the information repositories. For further information you may contact Ginny Narsete at (312) 886-4359 or Ed Hanlon at (312) 353-9228.

tial development within the floodplain, erosion control, and revegetation of excavation or cover areas. Inspection and chemical sampling as part of long-term monitoring would also be included under the seven action alternatives. Wetland mitigation would also be considered under the seven alternatives. The eight alternatives are summarized as follows:

- Alternative 1—No Action. Cost: \$0
- Alternative 2—Placement of a 6- to 12-inch soil cover over areas of contamination. Cost: \$4.6 million.
- Alternative 3A—Placement of a 6- to 12-inch soil cover over some areas of contamination. Excavation and off-site disposal of contaminated soil in other areas. Cost: \$8.9 million.
- Alternative 3B—Placement of a 6- to 12-inch soil cover over areas of contamination in some areas. Excavation and off-site disposal of contaminated soil in other areas. Similar to Alt. 3A except excavation would be required near residential areas. Cost: \$9.5 million.
- Alternative 4—Placement of a 6- to 12-inch soil cover over areas of contamination. Similar to Alt. 2 except that the soil cover in the

industrial area would be more extensive under Alt. 4. Cost: \$5.8 million.

- Alternative 5—Excavation and off-site disposal of contaminated soil. Excavated areas would be backfilled with clean soil. Cost: \$19 million.
- Alternative 6—Excavation and off-site thermal treatment of soil contaminated above a certain level. Excavated areas would be backfilled with clean soil. Cost: \$21.3 million.
- Alternative 7— Placement of a 6- to 12-inch soil cover over areas of low-level contamination in residential areas. Excavation and on-site disposal of contaminated soil in other areas. Cost: \$6.9 million.

## **Proposed Remedial Alternative**

The U.S. EPA used nine criteria (described in the attached fact sheet) to evaluate all the alternatives. Based on this evaluation, the U.S. EPA recommends Alternative 7. Alternative 7 would provide the most protectiveness and long-term effectiveness at the lowest overall cost. The attached fact sheet describes Alternative 7 in detail.